



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,656	06/01/2001	Masahiko Hatori	JP920000188US1	2784
47052	7590	11/15/2005	EXAMINER	
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP PO BOX 51418 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2677	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/872,656

Applicant(s)

HATORI ET AL.

Examiner

Kimnhung Nguyen

Art Unit

2677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed on 9/2/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5-10, 14, 15, 17 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 11 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. The claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18, 20-25 are pending. The examination results are as following.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5, 9, 14, 17 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McKay et al. (US 6,313,822).

Regarding claims 1, 9, 17, and 20-21, McKay et al. discloses in figs. 8-9, a computer system or display control apparatus having a central processing (see RAM339) and a display apparatus (100, fig. 1), the computer system comprising an input unit section operable to receive user input selecting zoom factor that specifies a predetermined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of the display apparatus (see fig. 9, see zoom factor and the setting of hardware, see col. 13, lines 16-27, 43-46, col. 14, lines 1-16); a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on the image displayed on the display screen in accordance with the pre-determined magnification amount by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from the first resolution (1280x1024) to a second resolution (768x1024, see col. 13, lines 16-27) in response to the user input selecting the zoom factor.

Regarding claim 2, McKay et al. discloses in fig. 1, the computer system further comprises a window resizing unit operable to resize a window displayed on the display screen in accordance with the second resolution in response to user input selecting the zoom factor.

Regarding the claims 5, 14, McKay et al. discloses further comprising an electrical switch (314, fig. 5) operable to accept the user input selecting the zoom factor (see col. 17, lines 54-63).

Regarding claim 10, McKay et al. discloses in fig. 9, the input section is operable to present one zoom factor to the user selection, zoom factor specifying a respective predetermined magnification amount and being a number dependent upon allowable resolutions of the display apparatus (see col. 17, lines 54-63).

Regarding claims 22-25, McKay et al. discloses that the zoom factor is number equal to the first resolution divided by the second resolution (see col. 17, lines 54-63).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay et al. (US 6,313,822) in view of Karaki et al. (US patent 5,612,715).

McKay et al. discloses every feature of the claimed invention having a zoom factor as discussed above, excluding the electrical switch is provided as a key on a keyboard that is

Art Unit: 2677

coupled to the computer system, user input selecting is received through the user clicking on a button within a graphical user interface.

Karaki et al. discloses in fig. 3, the electrical switch (M25) is provided as a key on a keyboard that is coupled to the computer system (see col. 3, lines 18-24), and user input selecting is received through the user clicking on a button (see switch button M25 on the keyboard) within a graphical user interface (M21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the using the electrical switch is provided as a key on a keyboard that is coupled to the computer system, and user input selecting is received through the user clicking on a button within a graphical user interface as taught by Karaki et al. into the system having zoom of Mckay et al. because these would provide a key switching between the entire screen including one window and signal out put (see col. 3, lines 18-24), which makes to see the images more clearly.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mckay et al. (US 6,313,822) in view of Curtis (US patent 6,580,434).

Mckay et al. discloses a computer system comprising an input unit and a display zoom factor as discussed above. However Mckay et al. does not disclose the input unit is a voice input apparatus.

Curtis discloses a conventional computer (20) in fig. 1, comprising a program modules stored on the hard disk, magnetic disk (29), ROM (24) or RAM (25). The computer (20) may be

Art Unit: 2677

connected to keyboard (40) or other input devices such as microphone (voice input, see column 5, lines 30-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the voice input device such as microphone as taught by Curtis into the display system of McKay et al. having Zoom factor because this would convert the sound signal from the outside to the main processing unit, which help the user to easy to hear the information of the system.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 3, 11, 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The present invention is directed to a computer system having a central processing unit (CPU) and a display apparatus coupled to the CPU, the computer system comprising a input section operable to receive user input selecting a zoom factor. The combination of the closest prior art of McKay et al. (US 6,313,822) and Karaki et al. (US 5,612,715) show a similar invention, however, they fail to teach that a display status restoring unit operable to hold a first display status of the image displayed on the display screen before the resolution of the display apparatus is changed to the second resolution by the resolution changing unit, the display status restoring unit further operable to restore the image displayed on the display screen to the first display

Art Unit: 2677

status when the resolution of the display apparatus is restored to the first resolution as claims 3, 11 and 18.

***Response To Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18, 20-25 filed on 9/2/05 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2677

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnhung Nguyen  
November, 14, 2005

AMR A. AWAD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

